

TO: All prospective Offerors

SUBJECT: Response to Questions regarding Request For Proposal RFP5-03275-352,  
Phase 1 of the Next Generation Space Telescope (NGST) Observatory Phased  
Acquisition

Reference: Request For Proposal (RFP) dated April 23, 1999

The purpose of this letter is to respond to the comments received on the RFP. The sources of the comments are not identified. In most cases, the comments have been quoted verbatim.

1) The offerors base their architecture on initial concepts from GSFC and others that were thought to enable a Design Reference Mission (DRM) completion time in less than 2.5 years. Analysis shows that the Feb 99 DRM cannot be completed in this time. What should we do?  
**Response: The Ad Hoc Science Working Group (ASWG) has created the current design reference mission (DRM) with the assistance of the exposure time calculator (ETC) developed at STScI. Many ASWG members used the times estimated by the ETC to help craft their programs. As the components of the ETC are improved (e.g. better models of zodiacal backgrounds, improved detector characteristics, addition of realistic scheduling components) and as more thorough knowledge of specific astronomical investigations are learned, the time to complete the DRM will change and the DRM will slowly evolve. In order to accommodate these dynamics at this time, the scientific requirement for DRM completion time has been modified. (See SOW section 1.2.1 – Scientific Requirements.) Contractors should refer to the configuration controlled document NGST-SCI-SPEC-00004 (<http://www.ngst.nasa.gov/cgi-bin/pubdownload?Id=257>) for the official version of the DRM. Once changes are approved, this document will be updated as necessary. Notices will be sent out via email (listservs ngstweek and ngstsci; see <http://www.ngst.nasa.gov/News/lists> for information about how to receive these notices).**

2) In order to provide GSFC with the Oral Presentation required by the RFP, we request the opportunity to visit the room that will be used for the presentation. This visit would allow the contractor to see the layout of the room and to understand and test the available media capability (vugraph or vugraphs and multimedia platform).

**Response: The room is available for your viewing. Presentations will be at GSFC in Building 7, Room N200G. Specific instructions regarding the times of the presentation and other instructions will be provided separately to those offerors that have notified the Government of their intent to provide a proposal. (Note that this response is due immediately.)**

3) The RFP has a payment schedule in Section B.1. A. We request that a deliverable be developed for the seventh month to support an additional payment.

**Response: Change has been made supporting a payment in the sixth month. See amendment 1 for official correction. Offerors should note that the payments should correspond to the submitted time phased cost proposal AND be reasonable for the value of the deliverable. The major valued item is the final deliverable report.**

4) Although specific instructions were not given in the RFP, does the Government desire offerors to complete the "Value" column contained in Section B.1.A.

**Response: Correct. See amendment 1 for official correction. Offerors should make this correction in the signed contracts submitted with the proposal.**

5) The parenthetical note in the final paragraph of section B.1.B, which now reads, "(item 5 above)" should actually read, "(item 4 above)."

**Response: This was correct. However, with the addition of a deliverable item, no change is now necessary. See amendment 1.**

6) The parenthetical note in Statement of Work paragraph 4.6, which now reads, "(see 4.5 above)" should actually read, "(see 4.4 above)."

**Response: Correct. See amendment 1 for official correction. Offerors should make this correction in the signed contracts submitted with the proposal.**

7) In the Work Breakdown Structure, paragraph 2, the last sentence should be deleted.

**Response: Correct. See amendment 1 for official correction. Offerors should make this correction in the signed contracts submitted with the proposal.**

8) On the second page of the web-site for this acquisition there is a notice to the effect that the official version of the RFP is the "original printed document." The NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) notice is found at:

<http://procurement.nasa.gov/EPS/GSFC/Synopses/RFP5-03275-352/sol.html#Solicitation>

The notice states: "Any inconsistency between the original printed document and the disk or electronic document shall be resolved by giving precedence to the printed document." What does this mean?

**Response: NASA uses NAIS to post solicitations. However, the final contract will be in printed form and will incorporate offeror fill-in's and may incorporate other changes (whether in the initial offer or as a result of any discussions), including minor changes of an administrative nature. Therefore, for purposes of the solicitation, offerors shall assume that the electronic version is the "original". However, for the purposes of any resulting contract, the printed copy shall prevail.**

9) Exhibit 1 "Element of Cost Summary" of Exhibit 2 to the RFP does not cover the last 2 months of the effort.

**Response: Please add a column "Basic Year 3" before the column "Total Basic."**

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me.

Gifford P. Moak  
Contracting Officer